



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,634	09/19/2003	William B. Ardern II	ARD-101US	5073
24314	7590	02/21/2006	EXAMINER	
JANSSON, SHUPE, MUNGER & ANTARAMIAN, LTD 245 MAIN STREET RACINE, WI 53403			HOGE, GARY CHAPMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3611	
DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/664,634	ARDERN, WILLIAM B.
	Examiner Gary C. Hoge	Art Unit 3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-33 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-33 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/18/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 2, it appears that “polyethylene” has been misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3-6, 23, 24, 27, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Antinone (6,327,749).

See Fig. 5. Antinone discloses a tri-panel binder clip sleeve, the binder clip comprising first and second resilient jaw portions, a connecting spine portion therebetween and an outer surface along each of the jaw and spine portions, the binder clip further having a handle secured to each of the jaw portions such that pressing together of the handles separates the jaw portions, the tri-panel binder clip sleeve comprising a first panel in overlying relationship with the first jaw portion outer surface, the first panel having an outwardly-facing surface, a second panel in overlying relationship with the second jaw portion outer surface, and a third panel spaced between and connecting the first and second panels, the third panel being in overlying relationship with the spine portion and having an outwardly-facing surface. The recitation that

the outwardly-facing surfaces are “for displaying indicia located thereon” is merely a statement of intended use.

Regarding claims 5 and 30, the handles 2 of the clip disclosed by Antinone frictionally engage the sleeve 4.

Regarding claim 6, see col. 3, line 12.

4. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Manley (D479,146).

See Fig. 1. Manley discloses a tri-panel binder clip sleeve, the binder clip comprising first and second resilient jaw portions, a connecting spine portion therebetween and an outer surface along each of the jaw and spine portions, the binder clip further having a handle secured to each of the jaw portions such that pressing together of the handles separates the jaw portions, the tri-panel binder clip sleeve comprising a first panel in overlying relationship with the first jaw portion outer surface, the first panel having an outwardly-facing surface, a second panel in overlying relationship with the second jaw portion outer surface, and a third panel spaced between and connecting the first and second panels, the third panel being in overlying relationship with the spine portion and having an outwardly-facing surface. The recitation that the outwardly-facing surfaces are “for displaying indicia located thereon” is merely a statement of intended use.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 6-12, 15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manley (D479,146).

Regarding claims 2, 10 and 15, Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, the panels appear to be slightly larger than the outer surfaces of the clip. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the panels the same size as the outer surfaces of the clip because such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claims 6, 8, 9 and 18, Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, it is not known what material is used to make the sleeve. Because it is within the level of ordinary skill of a worker in the art to select from among known materials on the basis of their suitability for the fabrication of a given device, and since a person having ordinary skill in the art would know that paper, plastic or vinyl would be suitable for the fabrication of a sleeve, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to fabricate the sleeve disclosed by Manley from paper, plastic or vinyl as a matter of choice in design, based on such factors as cost and availability of the materials to the designer.

Regarding claims 7, 11 and 19, Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, it is not known whether an adhesive assists in securing the sleeve to the clip. Nevertheless, it is well known to use an adhesive to secure one thing to another and it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an adhesive between the sleeve and the clip, in order to attach the sleeve to the clip more securely. It was also well known to apply adhesive to the entire face of a thing being adhered thereby, and it would have been obvious to apply the adhesive to the whole surface of the sleeve, in order to maximize the adhesion of the adhesive.

Regarding claims 12, 17 and 20, see Figs. 1 and 2.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manley (D479,146), as applied to claim 7, above, and further in view of Bennett et al. (5,522,586).

Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, although the sleeve is folded in two places, it apparently does not include a perforation to assist in the folding. Bennett teaches (col. 2, lines 56-59) that it was known in the art to provide a perforation to assist in the folding of a sheet.

8. Claims 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manley (D479,146) in view of Will et al. (5,766,795).

Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, the sleeve apparently does not include a transparent protective layer. Will et al. teaches (see the Abstract) that it was known in the art to provide a transparent protective layer on a label. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the sleeve disclosed by Manley with a transparent protective layer, as taught by Will, in order to protect the sleeve.

9. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manley (D479,146) in view of Antinone (6,327,749) and Lasprogata (5,839,215).

Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, Manley does not disclose indicia on the sleeve. Antinone teaches that it was known in the art to provide indicia on a sleeve of the type disclosed by Manley. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the sleeve disclosed by Manley with indicia, as taught by Antinone, in order to advertise the subject matter of the indicia. Further, Antinone does not disclose using raised indicia. Lasprogata teaches that it was known in the art to use raised indicia. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the indicia on the sleeve disclosed by Manley, as modified by Antinone, raised, as taught by Lasprogata, in order to create a pleasing aesthetic effect.

10. Claims 23-25 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manley (D479,146) in view of Antinone (6,327,749).

Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, Manley does not disclose indicia on the sleeve. Antinone teaches that it was known in the art to provide indicia on a sleeve of the type disclosed by Manley. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the sleeve disclosed by Manley with indicia, as taught by Antinone, in order to advertise the subject matter of the indicia.

Regarding claims 24 and 30, see Figs. 1 and 2.

Regarding claims 25 and 31, Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, it is not known whether an adhesive assists in securing the sleeve to the clip. Nevertheless, it is well known to use an adhesive to secure one thing to another and it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an adhesive between the sleeve and the clip, in order to attach the sleeve to the clip more securely.

Regarding claim 28, Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, the panels appear to be slightly larger than the outer surfaces of the clip. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the panels the same size as the outer surfaces of the clip because such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claims 32 and 33, Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, it is not known what material is used to make the sleeve. Because it is within the level of ordinary skill of a worker in the art to select from among known materials on the basis of their suitability for the fabrication of a given device, and since a person having ordinary skill in the art would know that paper or mylar would be suitable for the fabrication of a sleeve, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to fabricate the sleeve disclosed by Manley from paper or mylar as a matter of choice in design, based on such factors as cost and availability of the materials to the designer.

11. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manley (D479,146) in view of Antinone (6,327,749), as applied to claim 23, above, and further in view of Will et al. (5,766,795).

Manley discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, the sleeve apparently does not include a transparent protective layer. Will et al. teaches (see the Abstract) that it was known in the art to provide a transparent protective layer on a label. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the sleeve disclosed by Manley with a transparent protective layer, as taught by Will, in order to protect the sleeve.

*Conclusion*

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary C. Hoge whose telephone number is (571) 272-6645. The examiner can normally be reached on 5-4-9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (571) 272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Gary C Hoge  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3611

gch